

## **EXHIBIT G**

- 1 -

1  
2 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
3 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK  
4 Case No. 05-44481 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02619 (RDD);  
5 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02242 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02256 (RDD);  
6 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02333 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02580 (RDD);  
7 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02661 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02743 (RDD);  
8 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02768 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02769 (RDD);  
9 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02790 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02076 (RDD);  
10 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02084 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02096 (RDD);  
11 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02125 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02177 (RDD);  
12 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02188 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02211 (RDD);  
13 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02212 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02236 (RDD);  
14 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02250 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02262 (RDD);  
15 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02270 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02291 (RDD);  
16 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02328 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02337 (RDD);  
17 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02348 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02432 (RDD);  
18 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02436 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02449 (RDD);  
19 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02479 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02525 (RDD);  
20 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02534 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02539 (RDD);  
21 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02551 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02581 (RDD);  
22 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02597 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02618 (RDD);  
23 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02623 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02659 (RDD);  
24 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02672 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02702 (RDD);  
25 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02723 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02743 (RDD);

VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

212-267-6868

[www.veritext.com](http://www.veritext.com)

516-608-2400

- 2 -

1 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02744 (RDD); Adv. Proc. No. 07-02750 (RDD);  
2 Adv. Proc. No. 07-02188 (RDD)

4 In the Matter of:

5 DPH HOLDINGS CORP., et al.,

## 6 Reorganized Debtors.

8 DELPHI CORPORATION, et al.,

9 | Plaintiffs.

10 -against-

11 SETECH INC., et al.

12 Defendants.

13.  $\frac{1}{x^2} - \frac{1}{x} = \frac{1}{x(x-1)}$

14 DELPHI CORPORATION, et al.,

15 Plaintiffs.

16 -against-

17 DUPONT COMPANY, et al.,

18 | Defendants.

20 DELPHI CORPORATION, et al.,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 -against-

23 ECO-BAT AMERICA

24 | Defendant.

- 3 -

2 | DELPHI CORPORATION, et al.,

3 | Plaintiffs,

4 -against-

5 GLOBE MOTORS INC.,

6 : Defendant.

8 DELPHI CORPORATION, et al.,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 -against-

11 PHILIPS SEMICONDUCTOR, et al.,

12 Defendants.

14 DELPHI CORPORATION, et al.,

15 Plaintiffs,

16 : -against-

17 SUMMIT POLYMERS INC.,

Defendant.

20 DELPRI CORPORATION, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

22 -against-

23 M & Q PLASTIC PRODUCTS, et al.,

24 Defendants.

- 14 -

1                   U.S. Bankruptcy Court  
2                   300 Quarropas Street  
3                   White Plains, New York  
4  
5                   July 22, 2010  
6                   10:20 AM

7  
8  
9       B E F O R E:  
10      HON. ROBERT D. DRAIN  
11      U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

12  
13  
14  
15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

212-267-6868

VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

[www.veritext.com](http://www.veritext.com)

516-608-2400

DPH HOLDINGS CORP., et al.

- 277 -

1 re Hydrogen, LLC, 2010 WL 1609, 536 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y., April 20,  
2 2010). In re McLaughlin, 415 B.R. 23 (Bankr. D.N.H. 2009)  
3 In re Caremerica Inc., 409 B.R. 737 (Bankr. E.D.N.C. 2009).

4 I've stated during oral argument why I believe all  
5 three of these elements of the claim need to be pled with more  
6 clarity in the context. In particular, while it may seem at  
7 first glance that anyone receiving money has to receive it for  
8 some purpose and therefore it's reasonable to infer in the  
9 context that that purpose is to pay an antecedent debt, that is  
10 not always the case. Debtors may pay COD or in advance. And  
11 in addition, in identifying the debt, a complaint may therefore  
12 also enable a debtor to show that the creditor, or the  
13 transferee, rather, received more than it would otherwise in a  
14 Chapter 7 case which would, in the case of a contract that had  
15 been subsequently assumed, be a basis for dismissing the claim.

16 So I concluded that the complaints need to be  
17 dismissed, and I've given DPH Holdings forty-five days from  
18 today to file a motion for each complaint seeking leave to  
19 amend each complaint. That motion should attach the form of  
20 complaint -- or must attach the form of complaint that would be  
21 proposed to be filed as an amended complaint. And if such a  
22 motion is not filed for any particular complaint, that  
23 complaint will be dismissed upon the movant submitting to me a  
24 proposed order dismissing the complaint, CC'ing on the e-mail  
25 counsel for DPH and stating that in fact notwithstanding my

— VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

212-267-6868

[www.veritext.com](http://www.veritext.com)

516-608-2400